

**Exhibit E**  
**to the**  
**Declaration of Shawn G. Hansen**  
**in Support of Visto's Motion to Stay Proceedings**  
**Relating to Research in Motion Limited's**  
**Patent Pending Reexamination**

Robert G. Krupka, P.C. (Bar No. 196625)  
E-mail: bkrupka@kirkland.com  
Marc H. Cohen (Bar No. 168773)  
E-mail: mcohen@kirkland.com  
Philip T. Chen (Bar No. 211777)  
E-mail: pchen@kirkland.com  
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP  
777 South Figueroa Street  
Los Angeles, California 90017  
Telephone: (213) 680-8400  
Facsimile: (213) 680-8500

Attorneys for Plaintiff  
RESEARCH IN MOTION LIMITED

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

RESEARCH IN MOTION LIMITED,

Plaintiff,

v.

VISTO CORPORATION,

Defendant.

AND RELATED COUNTERCLAIMS

Case No. C-07-3177 (MMC)

**RESEARCH IN MOTION LIMITED'S  
DISCLOSURE OF ASSERTED CLAIMS  
AND PRELIMINARY INFRINGEMENT  
CONTENTIONS**

Pursuant to Patent L.R. 3-1, Plaintiff and Counterdefendant Research In Motion Limited ("RIM") hereby submits its Disclosure of Asserted Claims and Preliminary Infringement Contentions. RIM's Document Production Accompanying Disclosure pursuant to Patent L.R. 3-2 accompanies these contentions. This disclosure is based upon information currently available to RIM. Because RIM has not yet received documents or other things related to these infringement contentions from Defendant and Counterclaimant Visto Corporation ("Visto"), and because RIM's investigation is continuing, RIM reserves the right to supplement and/or modify these disclosures to the full extent allowed under the Local Rules and Patent Local Rules of this District.

1 **Patent L.R. 3-1(a): Each claim of each patent in suit that is allegedly infringed by each**  
2 **opposing party.**

3 RIM asserts that Visto infringes claims 9-13 of U.S. Patent No. 5,889,839 (the "Asserted  
4 Claims").

5 **Patent L.R. 3-1(b): Separately for each asserted claim, each accused apparatus, product,**  
6 **device, process, method, act, or other instrumentality ("Accused Instrumentality") of each**  
7 **opposing party of which the party is aware. This identification shall be as specific as possible.**  
8 **Each product, device, and apparatus must be identified by name or model number, if known.**  
9 **Each method or process must be identified by name, if known, or by any product, device, or**  
10 **apparatus which, when used, allegedly results in the practice of the claimed method or process.**

11 RIM asserts that the Visto Mobile suit of products and services infringe the Asserted Claims.  
12 Specifically, RIM asserts that the Visto Mobile™ Enterprise Edition, the Visto Mobile™ Internet  
13 Edition, and the Visto Mobile™ Personal Edition (collectively, "the Visto Accused  
14 Instrumentalities") infringe the Asserted Claims.

15 **Patent L.R. 3-1(c): A chart identifying specifically where each element of each asserted claim is**  
16 **found within each Accused Instrumentality, including for each element that such party**  
17 **contends is governed by 35 U.S.C. § 112(6), the identity of the structure(s), act(s), or**  
18 **material(s) in the Accused Instrumentality that performs the claimed function.**

19 RIM's investigation and analysis of the Accused Instrumentalities is based on information  
20 made publicly available by Visto. Consistent with Patent L.R. 3-6, RIM reserves the right to amend  
21 and/or supplement this disclosure. RIM provides, at Appendix A, a preliminary chart specifically  
22 identifying where each element of each Asserted Claim is found in the Visto Accused  
23 Instrumentalities.

24 **Patent L.R. 3-1(d): Whether each element of each asserted claim is claimed to be literally**  
25 **present or present under the doctrine of equivalents in the Accused Instrumentality.**

26 RIM currently contends that the Visto Accused Instrumentalities literally infringe the  
27 Asserted Claims. Nevertheless, with respect to any claim limitation that may be found not to be  
28 literally infringed, RIM contends in the alternative that the Visto Accused Instrumentalities infringe  
such claim limitations under the doctrine of equivalents and that any element not found to be literally  
met is equivalently met because any difference between the claim limitation and the Visto Accused  
Instrumentalities is insubstantial. Consistent with Patent L.R. 3-6, RIM reserves the right to amend  
and/or supplement this disclosure in light of, among other things, the Court's construction of

1 disputed claim terms and information provided by Visto regarding the Visto Accused  
2 Instrumentalities.

3 **Patent L.R. 3-1(e): For any patent that claims priority to an earlier application, the priority**  
4 **date to which each asserted claim allegedly is entitled.**

5 The Asserted Claims are entitled to a priority date at least as early as March 25, 1996.

6 **Patent L.R. 3-1(f): If a party claiming patent infringement wishes to preserve the right to rely,**  
7 **for any purposes, on the assertion that its own apparatus, product, device, process, method,**  
8 **act, or other instrumentality practices the claimed invention, the party must identify,**  
9 **separately for each asserted claim, each such apparatus, product, device, process, method, act,**  
10 **or other instrumentality that incorporates or reflects that particular claim.**

11 RIM currently does not assert that any of its products incorporate or reflect the Asserted  
12 Claims.

13 DATED: October 19, 2007

KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP

14 By: 

15 Robert G. Krupka, P.C.

16 Marc H. Cohen

17 Philip T. Chen

18 Attorneys for  
19 RESEARCH IN MOTION LIMITED  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28